Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—With whom does the selection of witnesses lie?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Obviously the committee invite persons whose opinions on constitutional issues they value much.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Are the Government aware that selection of witnesses is not being made on any definite principles and that the list undergoes frequent changes?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—No. But the committee are free to examine whomsoever they want.

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Have the Government given any instructions to the committee as to the particular individuals who should be examined?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—No.

Kage Ichal and Sankighatta Kavals.

Q.—8. **Messrs. Patel HONNASIDDAIYA** and **T. THIMMARAYAPPA** (Magadi Taluk); **T. MADIAH GOWDA** and **M. SIDDE GOWDA** (Channapatna Taluk); **B. CHOODE GOWDA** and **M. B. GURULINGIAH** (Closepet Taluk); **C. N. NARASINGA RAO** (Bangalore City Municipality); **K. NARAYANA SETTY** (Magadi Municipality); **S. KARIYAPPA** and **Gurukar VENKATARAMANE GOWDA** (Kankanhalli Taluk); **A. M. VENKATASAMIAH** (Closepet Municipality); **N. APPANNA REDDY** (Bangalore Taluk); **A. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA** (Devanhalli Taluk); **H. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO, K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR, B. M. MUNISWAMAPPA** and **V. VENKATESAIYA** (Special Interests); **Patel HANUME GOWDA** (Dodballapur Taluk); **B. MALLAPPA** and **A. M. CHANNAMARE GOWDA** (Nelamangala Taluk); **K. P. PARASIVIAH** (Kankanhalli Municipality); **S. SHARABHANNA** (Anekal Taluk); **Shampur PAPANNA** and **S. MUNIVENKATAPPA** (Minorities).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) when the lands of Baganigere "*Kage Ichal Kaval*" and "*Sankighatta Kaval*" of Thippasandra hobli in Magadi Taluk were surrendered by the Stud Farm (dates may be furnished);

(*b*) whether any lands out of these kavals have been granted to Mr. H. K. Madiah;

(*c*) if so, the extent granted in each kaval;

(*d*) the rate per acre;

(*e*) whether there were any *darkhasts* for lands in Baganigere Kaval; if so, the names and addresses of the persons, the dates of application and the orders thereon may be furnished;

(*f*) whether it has been reported that Mr. H. K. Madiah has encroached upon more land than was granted to him in Sankighatta Kaval; if there is any such encroachment, the extent encroached upon and the date on which this fact was brought to the notice of Government;

(*g*) whether there were any applications from individuals for the disposal of the encroached area by *darkhast* sale; if so, the names and addresses of the applicants and the date of such applications;

(*h*) the action taken by Government in respect of the said encroachment and the said *darkhast* applications;

(*i*) the particulars of the rate of dry and wet assessments fixed on the lands granted to Mr. H. K. Madiah out of Sankighatta Kaval;

(*j*) the particulars of the rate of wet and dry assessments on the adjoining lands in Sankighatta Village?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasakta B. T. Kesavaiengar).**—

(*a*) On 11th February 1936.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) 55 acres in Sankighatta Kaval and 34 acres and 10 guntas in Baganigere Kage Ichal Kaval.

(*d*) At Rs. 25 per acre in both cases.

(*e*) A few applications were received and the parties were endorsed that they may purchase in auction.

(*f*) No.

(*g*) Yes. M. S. Gopaliah and Singri Gowda and others of Kempapura Village.

(*h*) Does not arise in view of answer to (*f*).

(*i*) The lands are assessed at Rs. 2-1-0 per acre subject to the condition that the grantee is liable to pay temporary water-rate for the area cultivated with wet crops.

(*j*) Dry rate ... Rs. 2- 1-0.
Wet rate ... ,, 6-10-0.

Mr. P. HONNASIDDIAH.—With reference to answer (*e*), is it not possible to give the names of the people who had given *darkhast* applications?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—No.

Mr. P. HONNASIDDIAH.—Are there any more lands which can be given to the other darkhastdars?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—There were only a few plots and they have been disposed of already.

Mr. Mummadi H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA.—With reference to answer (*e*) why should not the lands have been given away for upset price?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—This relates to a special case. Because the lands of the party were taken over by the Government, special consideration had to be shown to him.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Is it not a fact that 50 acres of land belonging to Mr. H. K. Madiah were acquired by Government?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes, and it was for that reason that the special consideration referred to was shown to him.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Are the Government aware that lands in the neighbourhood were selling at about Rs. 30 per acre?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—In Magadi Taluk, lands were sold in auction for Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 an acre.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Was it not after Mr. Madiah was given the lands that the applications of other darkhastdars were sent up?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I want notice.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Are the Government aware that Mr. Madiah had to spend about Rs. 250 to level up the lands?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I am not aware of that.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Is it not a fact that for a period of 15 years, the amount deposited by him was lying with the Government and no interest was allowed on that amount?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Yes. It was partly for that reason that some concession was considered necessary.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—When the Baganigere Kage Ichal Kaval was handed over to the Stud Farm, what was the estimated cost of land per acre?

The FIRST MEMBER (Rajamantrapravina S. P. Rajagopalachari).—There is no relation between the prices then and now. It might have been estimated roughly at Rs. 200 per acre.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—At what rate was the land given to Mr. Madiah valued?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—At first a rate of Rs. 35 had been fixed, but later on, it was reduced to Rs. 25 per acre.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—Was there a suggestion from any one that the lands had better be auctioned?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—There might have been, but, for special reasons, the lands were given to that particular gentleman. One of the special reasons was that in the past, some of his lands had been acquired, and for some years, as Mr. Byanna stated, he was asking for other lands in exchange in two or three different places. He could not be given lands in any of those places and so, 35 acres were given to him in this kaval.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—When people of Baganigere itself had not enough lands, was it right to have given the land to somebody else?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The villagers have enough lands and no inconvenience is caused to them as a result of this grant. The lands of Mr Madiah were acquired under peculiar circumstances and the party had just ground for complaint. The case had been pending for nearly ten years and the grievance of the party had to be redressed. So, on the recommendation of the Revenue Department, these lands were given to the gentleman.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—So much of valuable land has been given away to one individual. To that extent, have not the superior claims of local raiyats been ignored?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Government do not agree to that premise. If any others require lands, Government can give them. The land under reference was a kaval land just released for cultivation and in respect of such lands, nobody's claim can be characterised as either superior or otherwise.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—Even in the case of the kaval under reference, has it come to notice that the party had encroached upon more land than was granted to him?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—If it is so, *takrar takthes* will be filed by the concerned officials and will be investigated.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—Are the Government aware that wet crops were grown on these so-called dry lands and that the party has been punished for unauthorised cultivation?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Notice.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—Are the Government aware that the land was brought under cultivation before a *saguvali* chit was issued?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Notice.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—If the facts are as alleged, is not the party guilty of committing grave irregularities?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I cannot answer such hypothetical questions.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that the Sankighatta Kaval lands can be irrigated by the Sankighatta tank water?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Notice. Is it the grievance of the member that the lands ought not to have been given to Mr. Madiah?

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—No. But I wish to know whether it has come to the notice of the Government that water coming to the tank is being diverted by Mr. Madiah to his own lands and thus the water supply to the tank has been to some extent cut off?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I may at once tell the member that law is no respector of persons and if anybody has done anything illegal, he will take the consequences of his own actions. And I may also add that the point just now mentioned may be brought to the notice of the Deputy Commissioner so that he may take necessary action, if he has not done so already.

Mr. K. NARAYANA SETTY.—Did not the raiyats offer a price of Rs. 10,000 for these lands?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—No.

Mr. U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—What extent of land belonging to Mr. Madiah was acquired?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Notice.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—It is a question of policy. Government have got the power even to grant inams. But in this case, no inam has been given. Government had promised to give the lands to Mr. Madiah as a means of disposing of a case which had been pending for nearly ten years. I do not think it is right to discuss such a question on the floor of this House.

REPRESENTATIONS—*contd.*

No. 184.—Improvement of the road between Mysore and Bangalore *via* Bannur-Kankanhalli.

Mr. PUTTASWAMI GOWDA (Malavalli Taluk).

No. 189.—Construction of a bridge across the Cauvery near Bannur on the Bangalore-Mysore Road.

Mr. MAYI GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk).

Mr. PUTTASWAMI GOWDA represented that the two premier cities in the State, *viz.*, Bangalore and Mysore, were connected with each other by two different roads. The one was Mysore-Mandya-Maddur-Channapatna-Closepet-Bangalore road and the other was the one *via* Bannur-Malavalli-Halgur-Satnur and Kankanhalli to Bangalore. These two were more or less parallel roads and both of them lay across the Cauvery, the Lokapavani, the Shimsha and the Arkavathi rivers. The first of these was a provincial road and it was maintained in a very efficient condition. The other road was a district fund road which, for want of funds, could not be maintained in an equally efficient condition